

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/630,815	Applicant(s) CARNEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Jasmine Stokely-Collins	Art Unit 2423	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jasmine Stokely-Collins. (3) Michael CuvIELlo.

(2) Andrew Koenig. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 28 April 2010.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lemmons and Deller of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant discussed the invention with respect to a framework which separates iTV application behavior from content and from business rules. The examiner discussed their position and suggested potential claim ideas to help advance prosecution. The applicant will file a formal reply.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Andrew Y Koenig/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423
--	---